

PHOTIUS' *BIBLIOTHECA* IN BYZANTINE LITERATURE

AUBREY DILLER

THE *Bibliotheca* of Photius is probably the most famous work in mediaeval Byzantine literature. At least it is unique. The modern special dictionaries of literature are perhaps the nearest parallel, but Photius deals only with books, not authors or types or schools, and he makes no attempt to be systematic or complete. The work was a turning point in that it directed attention to the treasures of ancient classical literature, which had almost been forgotten at that time; but this was not its special purpose, for it includes just as much Christian literature, which had not been forgotten. Photius has been called a literary Columbus,¹ with some exaggeration, since he only rediscovered the old world of literature. Nevertheless the importance of his work is immense. Its current reputation is due in large part to the notices of books that have since been lost, but this is incidental. Its original value lies in the expression of the idea of wide reading with critical intelligence.²

In this article we intend to deal, not with the composition of Photius' work, but with its history from the moment it left the author's hands, presumably A.D. 855, until it became the common property of scholarship at the end of the fifteenth century. A large part of this history has already been written in Edgar Martini's *Textgeschichte* (1911), which gives a complete account of the MSS of the *Bibliotheca*.³ We will supplement this

¹ Krumbacher in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, I, 8 (1905), 271, cited in *Hermes*, 79 (1944), 44, note.

² F. Dvornik, "Patriarch Photius, Scholar and Statesman," *Classical Folia*, 13 (1959), 3-18; 14 (1960), 3-22.

³ E. Martini, *Textgeschichte der Bibliotheke des Patriarchen Photios von Konstantinopel, I. Teil: Die Handschriften, Ausgaben und Übertragungen* (*Abhandl. der phil.-hist. Kl. der k. sächsischen Gesellsch. der Wissenschaft*, 28, 6 [1911]). The second part, "der die unsernen Handschriften vorausliegende Phase bis zum Ur-exemplar des Werkes zum Gegenstand haben

from excerpts and other traces in Byzantine literature, many of which were collected by Martini himself, Heseler,⁴ and others. In a very keen investigation of certain evidence of this kind, bearing on Proclus' *Chrestomathy* (Photius' cap. 239), Albert Severyns threw a flood of light on the early history of the *Bibliotheca*.⁵ The new edition, begun auspiciously by René Henry in 1959, provides, as far as it goes, the one prerequisite for an effective evaluation of the *testimonia* for the history of the work, that is, a critical apparatus of variant readings. But unfortunately it goes only as far as cap. 185 at present; for the remaining two thirds we are in almost total darkness, the old edition of Bekker being of no use for this purpose.

Martini found that there are only two primary MSS of the *Bibliotheca*. Both were among the 482 Greek codices Cardinal Besarion presented to the Venetian Republic in 1468, and both are now in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice. Codex A (Marc. gr. 450) is the older. Martini, following Bruno Keil, ascribed it to the second half of the tenth century, but if I am not mistaken it is somewhat earlier. In the thirteenth century it was copied in codex B (see *infra*) and soon after was corrected extensively by Theodore

soll," was never published. See also "Studien zur Textgeschichte der Bibliotheke . . ., I. Der alte Pinax," Ό ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος, Πεντηκονταετηρίς, 1861-1911 (1921), 297-318, giving a critical text of the table of contents that precedes the text in the MSS. Also "Zur handschr. Überlieferung der Bibl. des Photios," *Charisteria Alois Rzach* (1930), 136-41, on codex Vat. gr. 1930-31, an apograph of Vat. gr. 1189, unknown to the author in 1911.

⁴ P. Heseler, review of Martini in *Berliner philol. Wochenschr.*, 33 (1913), 585-98.

⁵ A. Severyns, *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus, Première partie: le codex 239 de Photius, I. Étude paleographique et critique* (*Bibl. de la Fac. de Philos. et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liège*, 78 [1938]).

Scutariotes of Cyzicus⁶ in Constantinople.⁷ Bessarion acquired it from the heirs of Giovanni Aurispa in 1459. Codex M (Marc. gr. 451) is ascribed to the twelfth century. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries it was in the monastery of the Theotokos in Thessalonica. It was sent to Ambrogio Traversari from Chios in 1435.⁸ Codex B (Paris. gr. 1266), bombycine of the thirteenth century, is an apograph of codex A. It was seen in Chalke by Stephan Gerlach in 1577 and was among the 125 Greek codices acquired in the East for the Royal Library by François Sevin in 1728–32. Aside from excerpts, these are the only MSS of the *Bibliotheca* earlier than the 1460's, when A and M came together in Bessarion's library.⁹ Soon after that the *Bibliotheca* became more widely known through recent copies.

Codex A begins with the heading in majuscule Φωτίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου, followed by the letter to Tarasius (fol. 1^r) and the pinax (fol. 1^v–4^v). The text itself has the heading (5^r): ἀπογραφὴ καὶ συναρθμησις τῶν ἀνεγνωσμένων ἡμῶν βιβλίων, ὃν εἰς κεφαλαιώδη διάγνωσιν ὁ ἡγαπημένος ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Ταράσιος ἔξητήσατο· ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα εἴκοσι δεόντων ἐφ' ἐνὶ τριακόσια. Codex M probably had the same contents in the same order, but the first leaf is missing and the MS begins now with item 44 of the pinax. The titles *Myriobiblon* and *Bibliotheca* are late and spurious (see *infra*). The statement of the number of books read as 279 is correct; the number 280 found in the MSS and editions is due to the omission of 89 and the subsequent division of cap. 88. There are other errors of

⁶ Other codices possessed by Theodore Scutariotes are Marc. gr. 407, Paris gr. 1234, 1741, Bodl. Cromwell 19.

⁷ Martini (p. 15) supposes that codex A passed from Cyzicus to Athos after the death of Scutariotes and the fall of Cyzicus to the Turks. I do not think so. Scutariotes was active in Constantinople and probably resided there, and the presence of A there in the fourteenth century seems to be required by the excerpts, although we must reckon with codex B, which was also in Constantinople.

⁸ G. Mercati in *Studi e Testi*, 90 (1939), 19–21, 28.

⁹ The oldest of the Italian MSS of the *Bibliotheca*, Martini's hypothetical codex λ , was already a joint apograph of A and M.

enumeration in the MSS, especially in A. Codices AB omit capp. 185 and 279 in the text and the pinax and put cap. 239 after 233 in the text but not in the pinax. Codex M omits cap. 202 in the text but not in the pinax. All three old codices have suffered material mutilations: codex B is only a half, containing capp. 230–280, but it preserves the text of two quaternions lost at the end of A. Both A and M have been worked over by several later hands. Severyns found that the primary text of M differs remarkably from AB and is the product of arbitrary revision. In spite of considerable acumen, the reviser was not thorough or consistent and seldom improved matters. The text of A is generally superior.¹⁰

The earliest trace of Photius' *Bibliotheca* that has been found is an excerpt from cap. 239 in a scholion on Plato's *Republic* 394C in codex Paris. gr. 1807. This codex is to be attributed to the ninth century and so is contemporary with Photius. For various reasons it has often been supposed that the scholia in Paris. 1807 emanated directly or indirectly from Photius himself. The hypothesis is attractive, but not demonstrable. The text of the scholion is correct in one reading (διθύρω) where ABM are corrupt (διθυράμβω). Perhaps it was taken from Photius' autograph, while AM derive from an early apograph.¹¹

The next traces of the *Bibliotheca* are more extensive and more interesting. They are autograph scholia of Arethas of Caesarea (ca. 850–935)¹² found in two codices written for him by the scribe Baanes in 912–914, viz. Harley 5694 (Lucian) and Paris. gr. 451 (Clement, Justin, Eusebius, etc.). There are large excerpts from capp. 239 and 279 and slight traces of capp. 244 and 250. Cap. 209 also was used by Arethas in scholia on Dion

¹⁰ A. Severyns, "Les vies parallèles de Plutarque dans la Bibliothèque de Photius," *Mélanges Desrousseaux* (1937), 435–50, found the same general difference between AB and M in cap. 245 also, and it seems to hold throughout the *Bibliotheca*.

¹¹ Severyns, pp. 261–77, takes great pains to correct previous errors in the history of this scholion. His own conclusions are still valid, although we now know more about the early Plato codices.

¹² S. G. Kugeas, 'Ο Κατσαρείας Ἀρέθας καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ (1913).

Chrysostom, but the autograph codex has not survived. Arethas does not cite Photius by name. In cap. 239 the excerpts agree constantly with codex M against A. (In 209 the readings of A and M are not available; 279 is omitted in AB.) This fact led Severyns to identify Arethas with the corrector who produced the peculiar text of M.¹³ The characteristics of Arethas as known from autograph work in his own codices seem to agree well with the characteristics observed in the work of the corrector. Presumably codex M was copied from a lost codex owned and revised by Arethas like others that are preserved. Unfortunately the name of Arethas does not occur in M, but in lieu of that is the agreement of his autograph scholia with the text of M.

Next is a long excerpt from Photius' cap. 250 (Agatharchides) in the *Sylloge de historia animalium*¹⁴ of the scholar-emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (905–959), who is well known for works of this kind. Neither Photius nor Agatharchides is named. There are also some excerpts from Ctesias, but they do not seem to be from Photius' cap. 72.¹⁵ Although the readings of A and M are not available for cap. 250, Constantine's text seems to be independent of Arethas' revision in codex M.

There are other anonymous excerpts from Photius' cap. 250 in codex Marc. gr. 299, of the tenth or eleventh century, the oldest Greek alchemical codex, fols. 138^r–140^v.¹⁶ I collated the three MSS in Venice sufficiently to ascertain that the text is independent of M and probably of A also.¹⁷

¹³ Severyns, pp. 279–95, 339–57, 364–74, esp. 343f. That Arethas, as a disciple of Photius, acquired a copy of the *Bibliotheca* at an early age seems to me to be a mere assumption. All we know is that he had it after 914.

¹⁴ Sp. P. Lambros ed., *Excerptorum Constantini de natura animalium libri duo (Supplementum Aristotelicum)*, ed. Acad. litt. reg. Boruss. I, 1 [1885]), pp. 44–52, from Photius cap. 250 (450b12–454a32).

¹⁵ Lambros, p. XIV.

¹⁶ J. Bidez et al., *Catalogue des MSS. alchim. grecs*, 2 (1927), p. 14, from Photius cap. 250 (447b6–449a10 and 457b36–458b1). The excerpts occur in some other MSS also, probably apographs of Marc. 299, e.g. Marc. 598 (*ibid.*, p. 32).

¹⁷ For example 447b29 γνησίων A, χρυσίων M, χρυσορυχίων Marc. 299.

A long notice of the acts of Nicaea against Arius, which occurs in several MSS of the tenth century and later, has been shown by Heseler to be copied from Photius' cap. 256 with some retouching to conceal its source and character.¹⁸ Heseler adds that caps. 257 and 258 also occur separately in some early menologia.¹⁹ In all three cases, he says, "hat zweifellos das Bestreben, an die Stelle der grossen vormetaphrastischen Viten kürzere Texte zu setzen, mitgewirkt." The relation of these large excerpts to codices A and M of the *Bibliotheca* remains to be determined.

Several old MSS of the works of Athanasius of Alexandria, the oldest attributed to the eleventh century, have a notice excerpted partly, but not quite wholly, from Photius' caps. 139–140. The heading has been understood to say that the excerpt is from a lost letter of Photius to his brother Tarasius,²⁰ but I think it is rather a citation of the untitled *Bibliotheca* itself with its initial letter to Tarasius. The extra information can have been added by the excerptor on his own. This is the only citation of Photius by name that we have before the thirteenth century.

The so-called *Etymologicum Magnum* has an article on ἔλεγος entitled ἐκ τοῦ περὶ χρηστομαθίας Πρόκλου, which is excerpted from Photius' cap. 239, and P. Becker²¹ found four other tiny bits excerpted from 239 and three from 279 (532b27–8) widely distributed in the *Etymologicum*. Severyns shows that in cap. 239 they agree with A against M even in errors. Cap. 279, however, is lacking in A, and it may be doubted that it was the source for these excerpts. This *Etymologicum* is attributed to

¹⁸ P. Heseler, "Die Vita (Metrophanis et Alexandri) des Photius und die Acta in Nicaea (BHG² 1280)," *Byz.-neugr. Jahrbücher*, 13 (1937), 81–92.

¹⁹ *Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca* 1472 and 184; A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*, I, 1 (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, 50 [1937]), 483f., 497, 625. These excerpts, too, do not mention Photius; on this point Mr. Nigel G. Wilson, of the Bodleian Library, kindly inspected codex Barocci 240 fol. 9^v for me.

²⁰ H. G. Opitz, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius* (1935), 212–4.

²¹ P. Becker, *De Photio et Aretha lexicorum scriptoribus* (Diss. 1909) 62–5.

the early twelfth century. Our excerpts appear to be interpolations in the original text, but very early ones, as they are in all the MSS.²²

Two other scholars of the twelfth century, Michael Italicus and Eustathius, have each a single passage in which they draw on Photius' cap. 239. Severyns (pp. 319–36) examines them carefully and concludes that both depend on the revised text of codex M, itself of the twelfth century. If that is so, these excerpts have no connection with those in the *Etymologicum*.

These are all the traces of Photius' *Bibliotheca* in the middle Byzantine period (from the ninth to the twelfth century) I know of. They show that the work was well known from an early time. In fact some of them may be due to Photius himself. Two copies of the *Bibliotheca* survive from this period, exhibiting a pure and an impure text respectively. However, some of the traces at least are independent of both texts and seem to attest the existence of a third. We hope the situation will become clearer when the critical apparatus for the latter part of the *Bibliotheca* is available.

In the late Byzantine period (after the recovery of the metropolis in 1261) the situation is changed. The traces of the *Bibliotheca* are more frequent, but at least most of them derive from one or the other of the two old copies. Codex M was in Thessalonica. Unfortunately the location of codex A is not attested, but I think it was in Constantinople. Codex B was copied from A at the beginning of this period and probably remained in Constantinople too. In the fifteenth century both A and M made their way to Italy and finally, by 1468, into the possession of Bessarion. Given this location of the sources the proliferation of traces in the fourteenth century should be more from AB than from M, followed by an outburst in Italy towards the end of the fifteenth century.

We may begin our survey of the late Byzantine traces with the most interesting

²² Severyns, pp. 297–318, deals at length with previous errors regarding these excerpts. Becker and Severyns think the excerptor found cap. 239 (and 279) in a separate pamphlet, but I think the τοῦ in the title can refer just as well to the chapter in the *Bibliotheca*.

of all. These are excerpts in various codices, but all with the same heading (or nearly so) and probably all in the same handwriting. The heading supplies an old lack in the *Bibliotheca*, presenting us for the first time with a title for the nameless work, and that a bold one. It reads: τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου Φωτίου ἐκ τῆς πραγματίας αὐτοῦ τῆς λεγομένης μυριοβί-βλου κεφάλαιον. . . . The participle suggests that the author found this title already current, but the emphasis and the repetition suggests that it is of his own coinage. It is still used as an alternate.

Under this heading in codex Paris. suppl. gr. 256, fols. 239–47, which are a separate MS in the codex, in a different hand and ending abruptly, we have quite a corpus of excerpts from the *Bibliotheca*: capp. 212, 211, 232, 214, 251, 249, 278, 245, all more or less abridged.²³ Some of the chapters have numbers, and they agree with those of the second hand in codex A of the *Bibliotheca* (thus 251 is σν'). Martini (pp. 45, 106) found that the text of the excerpts also agrees with codex A after it was corrected by the third hand. Codex Paris. suppl. 256 belonged to Theodore Sophianus (d. 1456)²⁴ and later to Pierre Pantin (d. 1611) and Andreas Schott (d. 1629), both of whom resided in Spain in the latter part of the sixteenth century.²⁵

With the same heading and in the same handwriting Photius' cap. 187 occurs as an introduction to Nicomachus' *Arithmetica* in codex Vat. gr. 198, fol. 1^r (fig. 1). It has the incorrect number ππς' given to this chapter by the second hand in codex A because of the omission of cap. 185 (Martini, p. 8). The age and milieu of Vat. 198 are suggested by its contents,²⁶ which include citations of Nice-

²³ Capp. 214, 251 in Paris. gr. 1772 and capp. 251, 249 in Vindob. phil. gr. 336 (Lambeck 80) were probably copied from Paris. suppl. 256.

²⁴ L. Petit et al. edd., *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*, I (1928), 278. Theodore Sophianus also possessed codices Vat. gr. 1434, Ambr. gr. 230, 291, and part of Monac. gr. 361.

²⁵ J. E. Powell in *Class. Quart.*, 30 (1936), 146f.

²⁶ J. L. Heiberg ed., *Claudii Ptolemaei opera*, II (1907), pp. XXI–IV; G. Mercati and P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Codices Vaticani Graeci*, I (1923), 236–40; I. Düring ed., *Die Harmonielehre des Klaudios Ptolemaios* (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, 36, 1 [1930]), pp. XXXVI, LXII.

phorus Gregoras (fol. 88^v) and Nicolaus Cabasilas (fol. 318^r) by the primary hand, and notes referring to the year 6882 (1373-4) by a secondary hand (fol. 468^v, 516^v). Gregoras and Cabasilas were active controversialists in Constantinople in the middle of the fourteenth century. So the codex was probably written in the capital in the third quarter of the century. Ingemar Düring attributes it to the school of Gregoras himself, rightly rejecting Heiberg's attribution to Mt. Athos.

With an equivalent, but not quite the same heading, Photius' cap. 125 occurs as an introduction to the genuine works of Justin in codex Paris. gr. 450, dated A.D. 1363.²⁷ A quaternion from the beginning of a similar codex is found in codex 86 (now 60) in the library of the Patriarchate in Alexandria (formerly in Cairo), fol. 4-11.²⁸ Paris. 450 is not in the same handwriting as the excerpts in Paris. suppl. 256 and Vat. 198, but the quaternion in Alexandria may be. In that case it would be the head of the lost codex from which Paris. 450 was copied.

Since the numerous other late Byzantine traces of the *Bibliotheca* are mostly anonymous and undated, I shall arrange them in the order of the *Bibliotheca* itself.

Cap. 26 occurs in main part in at least two early MSS as an introduction to epistles of Synesius: Vat. gr. 64, dated 1270, fol. 85^r, and Paris. gr. 2988, fol. 8^v. The text is not from codex M.²⁹

Capp. 41 and 42 occur without headings in codex Barocci 142, fol. 240^v-241^r, added by a different hand after Theodore Lector and followed in the same hand by a similar notice of an unknown church history of the early tenth century.³⁰ The Barocci codex appears to

²⁷ J. C. Th. von Otto ed., *Justini philosophi et martyris opera*, I, 1 (1876), pp. XXI-III. An apograph of Paris. 450 is codex Phillipps 3081 (Claromont. 82, Meermann 57), now on deposit in the British Museum from the Fenwick Trust.

²⁸ J. Bidez ed., *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte* (1913), p. XXXII; *idem* ed., *Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte* (1960), p. XIV; Th. D. Moschonas, Κατάλογοι τῆς πατριαρχικῆς βιβλιοθήκης, I (Alexandria, 1945), p. 68.

²⁹ W. Fritz, "Die handschr. Überlief. der Briefe des Bischofs Synesios," *Abhandl. der phil.-hist. Abteil. der bayer. Akad. der Wissensch.*, 23 (1905), 324, 365.

³⁰ Edited by C. de Boor in *Byz. Zeitschr.*, 5 (1896), 16f.

be the collectanea of Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus for his church history (ca. 1320).³¹ Nicephorus says he found his sources in the great church of S. Sophia³², which suggests that the codex of Photius he used was at least not M. The text of the Barocci MS, however, agrees now with A now with M, though more substantially with A.³³

From cap. 57 a list of books of Appian's history was compiled, with some confusion, by a second hand in codex Laur. 70-5, of the fifteenth century, fol. 5^r.³⁴ The same hand wrote bits from capp. 57 (17a21) and 64 (26a28) on fol. 1^r and drew on cap. 83 for notices of the histories of Dionysius and Polybius on fol. 230^r and 248^r. There are also large excerpts from capp. 224 and 244 in different hands in this codex (see *infra*). Photius is never cited by name. The excerpt from cap. 57 does not share the slight errors of codex M of the *Bibliotheca*. This codex is a primary MS for Appian and other texts it contains. It was acquired by Janus Lascaris for Lorenzo de' Medici in Candia (Crete) in 1492.³⁵

Cap. 70 occurs in main part on a leaf inserted at the head of codex Vat. gr. 130 as an introduction to Diodorus' history, in a fourteenth-century hand (fig. 2).³⁶ The text agrees with codex A against M.

Cap. 160 occurs at the end of codex Matrit. N-101 (now 4641) as an epilogue to the works of Choricius of Gaza, with a remarkable

³¹ G. Gentz and K. Aland, "Die Quellen der Kirchengeschichte des Nicephorus," *Zeitschr. für die neutest. Wissensch.*, 42 (1949), 104-41.

³² *Patrologia graeca*, 145, p. 609C.

³³ Here are the readings of Barocci 142 agreeing with A or M, according to Henry's apparatus: 9a3 νέου A, 8 μετ' αὐτήν M, 24 τὸν τὴν M (sed τὴν per correct.), 27 -ιε A, 28 s. non om. A, 35 θράκα ἀναρρ. M, 35 γράφει A, 9b4 καὶ 2^o om. M, 8 συναγαγεῖν M.

³⁴ Bandini, *Cat. cod. graec. bibl. Laurent.*, II (1768), 659f.; Schweighäuser ed., *Appiani Alexandrini quae supersunt* (1785), III, 12f.; L. Mendelssohn in *Rhein. Museum*, 31 (1876), 210f. There are several apographs of Laur. 70-5 containing this excerpt: Breslau Rehdiger 14, Vat. gr. 142, Paris. gr. 1682, etc.

³⁵ *Rivista di filologia classica*, 2 (1874), 413, 422.

³⁶ G. Mercati and P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Codices Vaticani Graeci*, I (1923), 158. The excerpt was copied from this MS in codex Vat. gr. 996.

heading and incipit: τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου Φωτίου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Γεώργιον μητροπολίτην Νικομηδείας· οὗτος, δύπερ ἡγησας, Χορίκιος χαίρει μὲν εὐκρινεῖς κτλ.³⁷ Several letters to George of Nicomedia are found in the correspondence of Photius, but nothing like this. It seems necessary to agree with Iriarte that the epistolary form of this excerpt is a literary fraud, suggested by the epistle to Tarasius. The text agrees once at least with A against M. The Madrid codex, or another like it, was used by Macarius Chryscephalus (ca. 1350) in his ῥοδωνιά preserved in codex Marc. gr. 452, where the epistle to George occurs on fol. 96^r preceding works of Choricius.

The beginning of cap. 167 was excerpted in the introduction to a selection from Joannes Stobaeus preserved in codex Bruxell. 11360, fols. 1–66 of the fourteenth century.³⁸

The epigram on Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* at the end of cap. 186 was copied by a later hand at the end of Planudes' *Anthology* in codex Marc. gr. 481 fol. 100^r, with a false heading εἰς τὰ πεντήκοντα βιβλία τοῦ ιστορικοῦ Κώνωνος from the beginning of cap. 186.³⁹ (Photius has Conon and Apollodorus in one chapter.) In line 5, I read ἐκ δὲ μελάθρων, an attempt to make scan the corrupt reading of codex M ἐκ μελάθρων. Perhaps this excerpt was made after Marc. gr. 451 (M) and 481 were brought together by Bessarion.

Cap. 192 occurs in codex Marc. gr. 504, of the fourteenth century, at the end as an epilogue on the works of Maximus.⁴⁰

Capp. 222 and 223 occur in codex Vindob. theol. gr. 210 (266 Lambeck), fols. 239 (233)^v–324 (317)^v. The history of these excerpts is precise. A colophon on fol. 408 (398)^r says the codex was written for Isidore metropolitan of Thessalonica, who held that office late in the fourteenth century. The text of the excerpts agrees with codex M of the

³⁷ J. Iriarte, *Regiae bibliothecae Matritensis codices graeci manuscripti* (1769), 394–406; J. B. C. d'Ansse de Villoison, *Anecdota graeca* (1781), II, 16–8; R. Foerster and E. Richtsteig edd., *Choricii Gazaei opera* (1929), pp. V–XII.

³⁸ O. Hense, *De Stobaei florilegii excerptis Bruxellensibus* (1882).

³⁹ K. Radinger in *Rhein. Museum*, 58 (1903), 303.

⁴⁰ A. M. Zanetti and A. Bongiovanni, *Graeca D. Marci bibliotheca* (1740), 268, cited by Heseler p. 590.

Bibliotheca, which was in Thessalonica late in the thirteenth century (Martini, 19, 44f., 105f.). The excerptor quotes part of the original long heading of the *Bibliotheca*, replacing ἡμῖν with Photius' name and title, which he must have found on the lost first leaf of codex M. The Vienna codex was bought in Constantinople by Busbeck. A similar heading is quoted by Janus Lascaris from a MS he saw in Galata in 1491: ἐκ τῶν παρὰ τοῦ πατριάρχου Φωτίου ἀναγνωσθέντων καὶ συνοψισθέντων.⁴¹ This MS is not known to exist now. It seems to have been an excerpt, and the only early excerpt that preserves the original heading is Vindob. 210.

Large excerpts from capp. 224 (Memnon's history of Heraclea, 222b9–229b35) and 244 (Diodorus' histories, 377b7–379a33) occur in codex Laur. 70–5 (see *supra* on cap. 57), fols. 226^v–229^v and 63^v–64^v, written on blank leaves by two slightly later hands of the fifteenth century.⁴² A citation and quotation, reworded, from the end of the same portion of cap. 224 (229b28–35) occurs in a letter of Nicephorus Gregoras (ca. 1335).⁴³

Capp. 229 (265a38–b17) and 230 (275a5–33) are quoted by Gregory Mammé patriarch of Constantinople, 1445–1451, in his letter to the Emperor of Trebizond.⁴⁴ He cites ἐκ τῆς βιβλιοπανσυλλέκτου ἀνθολογίας⁴⁵ Φωτίου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. His text seems to agree with AB against M. Perhaps he had codex B, since A was probably already in Italy.

Cap. 230 (279b12–280a30) is quoted by Isaac Argyrus (fourteenth century) in an unedited opusculum in codex Vat. gr. 1102, fol. 29^v, citing Photius by name.⁴⁶

Cap. 239, Proclus' *Chrestomathy*, occurs separately in many MSS, the oldest being Marc. gr. 531, of the fifteenth century, item

⁴¹ *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 1 (1884), 396.

⁴² Copies of these excerpts are in codices Marc. gr. 523, Monac. gr. 101, Vindob. phil. gr. 14 (Lambeck 125).

⁴³ R. Guiland, *Correspondance de Nicéphore Gregoras* (1927), 163.

⁴⁴ *Patrologia graeca*, 160, pp. 232C–233C. The letter was written while Gregory was patriarch (216C).

⁴⁵ The same monstrous title occurs in another connection in codex Athous 3714 Dionysiu 180, of the thirteenth or fourteenth century.

⁴⁶ G. Mercati in *Studi e Testi*, 56 (1931), 231 note 2.

479 in Bessarion's donation of 1468, fols. 253^v–257^v. Others are Vat. gr. 1408, Vallicell. gr. 39, Scorial. gr. Y.I.13. From the last, it was edited by Andr. Schott in Tarragona in 1585. The text is that of codex M. Probably it was copied in Marc. 531 from M in Bessarion's library, like cap. 186 in Marc. 481 (see *supra*). The heading cites Proclus, but not Photius. Severyns ignores these MSS.⁴⁷

Cap. 244 occurs with cap. 224 in codex Laur. 70–5 (see *supra*).

An excerpt from cap. 278 (528a40–b22) occurs in codex Vatic. gr. 2222, fols. 317–318, of the fourteenth century.

Cap. 279, Helladius' *Chrestomathy*, occurs in main part without title in codex O. I.5 (1029) in Trinity College, Cambridge, of the fourteenth century, fols. 53^r–56^v. Since cap. 279 is omitted in codices AB, this MS must derive from codex M in Thessalonica, like capp. 222 and 223 in Vind. theol. 210 (see *supra*). Since codex M is now partly illegible toward the end, the Cambridge MS has a primary value. It belonged to Henry Scrimger and Patrick Young. A copy of it, mistakenly entitled *Διονυσίου Ἀττικιστοῦ*, was sent to Joannes Meursius by Patrick Young in 1624⁴⁸ and cited often by Meursius in his notes on Helladius published posthumously in 1687. Martini and Heimannsfeld⁴⁹ overlooked this MS.

We may close the series of later traces of Photius' *Bibliotheca* with another case of extensive excerpting like that in codex Paris. suppl. 256. In two codices under the same heading ἐκ τῆς Φωτίου τοῦ σοφωτάτου πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀνθολογίας occur larger excerpts than any we have noticed so far. The codices are Riccardi gr. 12⁵⁰ and Vat. gr. 2240. The excerpts

⁴⁷ The copies of cap. 239 by Andr. Darmarius in the late sixteenth century are in a different category, and I omit them here (see *infra*, note 55).

⁴⁸ Fabricius, *Bibl. graeca* VII, p. 42; J. Lami ed., *Joan. Meursii opera omnia*, XI (1763), 426B. A copy of this excerpt is in Trin. Coll. MS O. 5.23 (1304).

⁴⁹ H. Heimannsfeld, "Zum Text des Helladius bei Photius (cod. 279)," *Rhein. Museum*, 69 (1914), 570–4.

⁵⁰ *Studi ital.*, 2 (1894), 482; Foerster and Richtsteig (see *supra*, note 37) p. XV. The excerpts from Photius in Paris. gr. 2957, Regin. gr. 131, Marc. gr. II, 13 (Henry, II, p. 121, note 2) appear to be copied from this MS.

coincide in part (both have capp. 259–268 *et al.*), but each has much that is lacking in the other. They seem to derive from codex A of the *Bibliotheca*. Both look like original MSS of the excerptor. Nevertheless Riccardi 12 is attributed to the fifteenth century, while Vat. 2240 appears to have been written in Venice about 1535.⁵¹

We have reached the limit set for this article and will not pursue the traces of the *Bibliotheca* in the sixteenth century except to investigate the new and final title it acquired at that time. Conrad Gesner, in his great bibliography entitled *Bibliotheca universalis* (1545), knows Photius' work only by the traditional heading: *Photii patriarchae descriptiones et enumeraciones authorum quotquot ipse legerat* (fol. 562^r). Not long after Pierre Gilles (d. 1555), in his little book *De Bosporo Thracio*, gives a hint of the new title: *Temporibus Phocionis (Photii), qui hypotheses praecipuorum scriptorum velut indices antiquae bibliothecae conscripsit . . .*⁵² The new title is not quite full-fledged in Franc. Turrianus' *Prolegomena ad Constitutiones Apostolicas* (1563): *Photius Constantinopolitanus in Bibliotheca sua, sic enim appellat [sic] volumen ingens de libris a se lectis*. In 1577 Stephan Gerlach described a codex he saw in Chalke as *Φωτίου πατριάρχου βιβλίον βαμβίκινον, ἡ λεγομένη μεγάλη βιβλιοθήκη*. He surely did not find this title in the original MS, if it was bombycine, and if it was codex B, as Martini thought (p. 22). Andr. Schott, in his edition of Proclus' *Chrestomathy* (1585) says, *Bibliothecam autem inscripsisse putant exemplo Diodori Siculi . . . Apollodori item Atheniensis exemplo, cuius extat Deorum Bibliotheca*. David Hoeschel, in the *editio princeps* of the whole *Bibliotheca* (1601), is more correct: *Opus hoc multiplicis eruditionis alioqui βιβλιοθήκην, alioqui splendidius μυριόβιβλον*,⁵³ ob

⁵¹ G. Mercati in *Rhein. Museum*, 65 (1910), 318.

⁵² P. Gillii, *De Bosporo Thracio*, lib. III, cap. IX, p. 347, ed. Elzevir (1632); C. Müller, *Geographi graeci minores*, II (1861), p. 92b.

⁵³ I surmise that Hoeschel learned the title *μυριόβιβλον* from Andr. Schott, and he from codex Paris. suppl. 256 (see *supra*, note 25). The title appears in Spain as early as 1568, perhaps from the same source; see Ch. Graux, *Essai sur les origines du fonds grec de l'Escurial* (1880), 44, 426, 428.

argumenti varietatem inscripserunt: nos, auto-rem secuti, Excerpta & Censuras librorum, quos Photius legerit (p. 920a). This Latin heading appears on the title page of the edition, preceded, however, by ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ ΤΟΥ ΦΩΤΙΟΥ. Meanwhile the title βιβλιοθήκη had appeared in manuscript copies of the whole work by Joannes Sanctamaura⁵⁴ and of cap. 239 (Proclus) by Andreas Darmarius,⁵⁵ both writing in the latter part of the sixteenth century.

⁵⁴ Vat. gr. 1189 and 1930-31 (see *supra*, note 3).

⁵⁵ Ottob. gr. 163, Ambr. gr. 336, Taurin. gr. 264, Monac. gr. 306, Old Royal 16.C.XIII; also a copy of cap. 190 in Jerusalem patr. 85 (Martini, p. 47).

While the title *Bibliotheca* was a Latin coinage of the sixteenth century, μυριόβιβλον was Greek of the fourteenth. The Greeks made good use of Photius' work, excerpting some chapters as aids to the study of the respective books and others for the sake of historical information. The idea of the work, however, did not take root among them. There were no successors or redactions of the *Bibliotheca*, such as there were, for instance, of the *Chronicles* of Theophanes and Georgius Monachus or of the *Etymologicum Magnum*. The *Bibliotheca* remained the only work Byzantium produced on the history of literature.

† Βασιλεὺς της Αίγανης τοῦ Ιωνίου οὐαὶ τοῖς Αἰγαίοις